

# **EXHIBIT 6**

Brian C. Rocca, S.B. #221576  
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com  
Sujal J. Shah, S.B. #215230  
sujal.shah@morganlewis.com  
Michelle Park Chiu, S.B. #248421  
michelle.chiu@morganlewis.com  
Minna Lo Naranjo, S.B. #259005  
minna.naranjo@morganlewis.com  
Rishi P. Satia, S.B. #301958  
rishi.satia@morganlewis.com  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 442-1000

Richard S. Taffet, *pro hac vice*  
richard.taffet@morganlewis.com  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178  
Telephone: (212) 309-6000

Ian Simmons, *pro hac vice*  
isimmons@omm.com  
Benjamin G. Bradshaw, S.B. #189925  
bbradshaw@omm.com  
**O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**  
1625 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 383-5300

*Attorneys for Defendants*

Glenn D. Pomerantz, S.B. #112503  
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com  
Kuruvilla Olas, S.B. #281509  
kuruvilla.olasa@mto.com  
Nicholas R. Sidney, S.B. #308080  
nick.sidney@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Kyle W. Mach, S.B. #282090  
kyle.mach@mto.com  
Justin P. Raphael, S.B. #292380  
justin.raaphael@mto.com  
Emily C. Curran-Huberty, S.B. #293065  
emily.curran-huberty@mto.com  
Dane P. Shikman, S.B. #313656  
dane.shikman@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
560 Mission Street, Twenty Seventh Floor  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 512-4000

Jonathan I. Kravis, *pro hac vice*  
jonathan.kravis@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
601 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 500E  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 220-1100

Daniel M. Petrocelli, S.B. #97802  
dpetrocelli@omm.com  
Stephen J. McIntyre, S.B. #274481  
smcintyre@omm.com  
**O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**  
1999 Avenue of the Stars  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 553-6700

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

**IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE**  
**ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

*Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*,  
Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES AND**  
**OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF**  
**CONSUMER' FIRST SET OF REQUESTS**  
**FOR ADMISSION**

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES AND  
OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF  
CONSUMER'S FIRST SET OF RFAS

1 admits that apps on devices running iOS or Android may access some, but not all, of the APIs  
2 within the Google Play Services SDK suite without Google Mobile Services having been  
3 preloaded on the device.

4  
5 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:**

6 Admit that in the United States, an App distributed through Google Play may only offer  
7 In-App Purchases through Google Play if it uses Google Play Billing and may only be updated  
8 through Google Play.

9 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:**

10 Google objects to this Request as impermissibly compound. Subject to and without  
11 waiving the foregoing objections, Google admits that an app distributed through Google Play in  
12 the United States may only be updated through Google Play. In all other respects, Google denies  
13 Request No. 9.

14  
15 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:**

16 Admit that when Consumers obtain Apps from Google Play they pay Google directly for  
17 any Apps or In-App Purchases.

18 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:**

19 Google objects to this Request as vague and ambiguous in its use of the terms "obtain"  
20 and "directly." Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Consumers may  
21 purchase apps or in-app purchases through methods including direct carrier billing and gift cards,  
22 and on this basis, Google denies Request No. 10.

23  
24 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

25 Admit that this Litigation was a factor in Google's decision to reduce the revenue share  
26 from 30% to 15% on the first \$1 million of developer earnings effective July 1, 2021.

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

Google admits that this Litigation was one factor considered in its decision to announce the service fee reduction on developers' first \$1 million in annual revenues, along with other factors including Google's competition with Apple.

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

Admit that this Litigation was a factor in Google's decision to reduce the revenue share from 30% to 15% on subscription developer earnings effective January 1, 2022.

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

Google denies that this Litigation was a factor considered in its decision to reduce its revenue share from subscription developers from 30% to 15%.

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

Admit that during the time period January 1, 2008, through and including the present, Google paid some mobile carriers revenue share in part to encourage them to promote Google Play over their own App Stores.

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

Google objects to this Request as vague and ambiguous in its use of the phrases "revenue share," "some mobile carriers," and "to encourage them to promote Google Play over other App Stores." Google further objects to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome as to time. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Google admits that during the time period January 1, 2008 through the present, it has paid revenue share to certain mobile carriers. In all other respects, Google denies Request No. 13.